

## **REMARKS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 5-6 and 12 remain in the application. Claims 7-11 and 13-14 have been cancelled previously. Claims 2-4 are cancelled herein. Claims 15 and 16 have been previously withdrawn. Claim 1 has been amended herein with the amendments supported by the original text of claims 2-4 and at least paragraph [0018] of the specification.

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,534,422 to Carpenter et al (hereinafter Carpenter). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Amended claim 1 includes the feature that the at least one radially approachable brush is pivoted tangentially about at least a portion of the circumference of the metal shaft strand. This tangential pivoting allows the cladding to be removed from around the circumference of the shaft. Carpenter does not disclose brushes that can be moved in such a manner around a shaft. The wire brushes in Carpenter rotate simply about their rotational axes. One brush can also move on a bearing arm, close to or farther away from the conductor. However, neither brush disclosed can move in a tangential manner around a portion of the circumference of the conductor.

Claim 1 has also been amended to include a step of severing the shaft strand of two consecutive adjustment shafts in a transition region. As these features were not originally within claim 1 as rejected by the Office action, they are not discussed in detail in these remarks under §102(b), but nevertheless are not disclosed by the Carpenter reference.

Because the features mentioned above are not disclosed by Carpenter, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter in view of U.S. 6,523,251 to Meisser et al (hereinafter Meisser) and in view of U.S. 2,202,580 to Louis F. Hahn (hereinafter Hahn). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Even if the references were combined in the manner suggested by the Office action, the claimed invention is not taught or suggested. Additional information is required.

As previously stated, amended claim 1 includes a step of "at least one radially approachable brush is pivoted tangentially about at least a portion of the circumference of the metal shaft strand." Carpenter does not teach or suggest this step because the brushes of Carpenter do not move in this manner.

Meisser also does not teach or suggest a removal device that can move in this manner. In Meisser, a milling tool points directly down towards or directly up from a flat table supporting the flat cable taught in Meisser. The milling tool cannot move tangentially around the circumference of a flat cable.

Hahn does not disclose a device for removing insulation from a shaft.

Thus, the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1.

Additionally, the teaching of the Hahn reference is not properly combined in the Office action with the teaching of the Meisser reference. The Meisser reference teaches away from the suggestion within the Hahn case. Namely, Meisser teaches away from severing the flat cable. Instead Meisser defines a cable with two distinctive ends that include conductors which are not shielded. Within Meisser, it is taught to test continuity in an automated manner between a conductor at an end and a conductor within a middle conductor that is exposed during the process taught by Meisser. To sever the flat cable of Meisser would mean losing the distinctive ends defined by Meisser and is not suggested.

At least for the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-6 and 12 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons described above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-6 and 12 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. SCH-16682.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/  
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

38210 Glenn Avenue  
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808  
(216) 566-9700